

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

The drawing were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Since the corrected or substitute drawings have been approved, a formal set of drawings are included by separate letter.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

The Examiner alleges that a peak signal is not shown in the drawings.

However, the Examiner attention is directed to Figure 4 of the corrected drawings. Here, a peak signal is clearly shown.

The Examiner alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive.

By the instant amendment, a new title has been provided. The new title is based on the preamble of Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the new title is indicative of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the track and hold circuit to input the clock signal is not clear.

Additionally, the Examiner alleges that the specification does not provide clear, full, concise and exact terms as what is supplying the clock signal to the input of the track and hold circuit. The Examiner further alleges that the specification does not provide full, clear, concise, and exact terms that the pulses of the comparator output are clock signals.

Notwithstanding the allegations of the Examiner, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 6, lines 2-5 of the instant specification. Here, the (track and) hold circuit tracks the input signal and holds it and outputs an output signal in accordance with a clock signal which is input.

Clearly the clock signal is input to the track and hold circuit since that is the only circuit being discussed in the sentence.

Next, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 6, lines 12-14 of the instant specification. Here, the specification states that the output of comparator 408 is a series of pulses and is input to the clock input of the track and hold circuit 400.

Clearly, this means that the output of comparator 408 is input to the clock input of the track and hold circuit 400.

This is confirmed by Figure 4.

Lastly, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 6, line 21 where the specification states that the output from the comparator 408 is a series of pulses which is input to the clock input of the track and hold circuit 400.

Clearly the output of the comparator 408 is a series of pulses. Equally clear is the fact that these series of pulses is input to the clock input of the track and hold circuit 400.

Clearly, Claims 1 and 2 comply with § 112 including the enablement requirement in that the claims include subject matter which is described in the specification in such a way to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to which it pertains or which is most clearly connected to make and use the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitted essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections.

This rejection is respectively traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the admitted structural cooperative relationships are the relationships between the input circuit and the comparator.

The Examiner alleges that the input circuit produces an input signal that is received by the track and hold circuit which holds the input signal and produces a peak signal.

However, Claim 1 clearly indicates that the input circuit inputs an input signal.

The comparator compares the input signal and the peak signal.

Claims 1 and 2 are in full compliance with § 112.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hancock.

It is respectfully submitted that Hancock does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the track and hold circuit to input the clock signal.

The output of comparators U2 and U3 are not input to element 110.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-2 patentably define over the applied art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136.
Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to
the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.', written in a cursive style.

W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633